ACADEMIC SENATE

The primary voice of the faculty in academic and professional matters at Santa Rosa Junior College.

MINUTES
4 November 2026, 3:15 p.m.
Santa Rosa: Senate Chambers, Doyle 145
Petaluma: Mahoney Library 726, 2nd Floor, Petaluma.
ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

PRESENT M. Anderman, L. Aspinall (remote), A. Atilgan Relyea, S. Avasthi, L. Branen-Ahumada, K. Bunas, J. Davis, K. Fortunati, V. Hamilton (Petaluma), A. Hsieh, T. Jacobson (Petaluma), D. Lukas, J. Lusk, T. Melvin, J. Nieto, A. Oliver, M. Ohkubo, M. Papa, N. Perrone, S. Rosen (Petaluma), T. Ruiz (Petaluma), E. Schmidt, I. Stockburger, I. Tircuit, N. Tran, N. Wheeler

ABSENT J. Bush (proxy Ohkubo)

CALL TO ORDER 3:15 p.m.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT - The Land Acknowledgement was read by M. Papa.

> *We acknowledge that we gather at Santa Rosa Junior College on the territorial traditional land of the Pomo People in Santa Rosa and the Coast Miwok People in Petaluma, past and present, and honor with gratitude the land itself and the people who have stewarded it throughout the generations.*

OPEN FORUM

1. **Senator Wheeler -** Retention and Pre-Transfer Mathematics Classes Open Forum Statement N. Wheeler
2. **Senator Atilgan Relyea -** Addressed EMLS Offerings Open Forum Statement A. Atilgan Relyea
3. **Senator Lukas -** Associate Access to Department Meetings Open Forum Statement D. Lukas
4. **Senator Schmidt -** Addressed Banner Open Forum Statement E. Schmidt

JUST CAUSE FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION BY SENATOR: L. Aspinall. No objection to participating remotely.

MINUTES ***MINUTES 21 OCTOBER 2026***

Senator Lukas made a motion to approve the minutes with the recommended correction. Seconded. Approved by 24 yes, 3 abstentions.

M. Anderman	yes	V. Hamilton	yes	M. Papa	yes
L. Aspinall	yes	A. Hsieh	yes	N. Perrone	yes
A. Atilgan Relyea	yes	T. Jacobson	yes	S. Rosen	abstain
S. Avasthi	abstain	D. Lukas	yes	T. Ruiz	yes
L. Branen-Ahumada	yes	J. Lusk	yes	E. Schmidt	abstain
K. Bunas	yes	T. Melvin	yes	I. Stockburger	yes
J. Bush (proxy Ohkubo)	yes	J. Nieto	yes	I. Tircuit	yes
J. Davis	yes	M. Ohkubo	yes	N. Tran	yes
K. Fortunati	yes	A. Oliver	yes	N. Wheeler	yes

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Senator Schmidt made a motion to shorten the time on Discussion Item 1. Academic Senate California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Resolution Packet Recommendations (30 min) to 15 minutes to add time to Action Item 2: The Reorganization of Academic Affairs. Seconded.

DRAFT

- A Senator asked for clarification on the need for the thirty minutes needed for the Academic Senate California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Resolution Packet Recommendations.

The Chair explained that the thirty-minute discussion would provide input on resolutions ahead of this week's Plenary, where he will vote on behalf of the SRJC Senate. The motion failed, 22 no votes, 3 yes votes, 2 abstentions.

M. Anderman	no	V. Hamilton	no	M. Papa	no
L. Aspinall	no	A. Hsieh	no	N. Perrone	no
A. Atilgan Relyea	no	T. Jacobson	no	S. Rosen	no
S. Avasthi	no	D. Lukas	yes	T. Ruiz	no
L. Branen-Ahumada	no	J. Lusk	abstain	E. Schmidt	yes
K. Bunas	no	T. Melvin	no	I. Stockburger	no
J. Bush (proxy Ohkubo)	no	J. Nieto	abstain	I. Tircuit	yes
J. Davis	no	M. Ohkubo	no	N. Tran	no
K. Fortunati	no	A. Oliver	no	N. Wheeler	no

REPORTS (3:30 – 3:35)

1. President's Report – J. Stover [President's Report]

- The work of the Academic Senate's Faculty Professional Development Committee continues with upcoming efforts to modernize the New Faculty Learning Program. The Committee will devote time in the remaining meetings to revise, update, and reenvision how to best support and welcome new faculty colleagues.
- The Banner standing item is not on the agenda today. Included in the President's Report is a detailed update from K. Jolley regarding Banner background.
- An update on the Faculty Staffing, which is led by M. Ohkubo, the Fall deadline has been adjusted to account for the upcoming early retirement incentives. M. Ohkubo is leading preparation efforts to bring AP7120b (Associate Faculty hiring) to the Senate Spring 2027.
- The Chair reviewed the carryover agenda items for November 18 and December 2.
    - Araceli Nuñez, North Bay Subregion Coordinator from the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) will be attending a future Academic Senate meeting.
    - The Academic Senate office and Executive Committee are working on creating public facing webpage documenting recommendations and resolutions in support of more consistent tracking and implementation.
    - A request has been received to agendize the topic of the Banner implementation and questions regarding replacement and purchase, quality, and priority related questions.
- The Chair noted It will take time to collect, edit, and produce a history/timeline of events into a document for Senators and the public.
- The Chair requested Parliamentarian, M. Anderman to address an update on voting by acclamation.
    - M. Anderman reviewed the proper use of voting by acclamation under parliamentary procedure. According to Robert's Rules, acclamation is generally used for uncontested elections, where a vote is not necessary if there is no opposition.
    - For resolutions, the process should be handled differently from moving an item from consent to action. Any senator may move an item from consent to action without opposition or a second. Approving a resolution by acclamation requires asking the Senate whether anyone objects. If no one objects, the resolution may proceed without a formal vote.
    - The Chair requested that M. Anderman attend the next ASEC meeting to review procedures with executive members.

INFORMATION (3:35 – 3:45)

1. SRJC Forward Proposal to Reorganize Academic Affairs (Sept 30th) M. Long, M. Hale

M. Hale and N. Perrone gave an informational presentation regarding the SRJC Forward proposal.

- A Senator inquired about the placement of EMLS under Humanities.

M. Hale reminded Senators that they can reach out via email with questions.

DRAFT

N. Perrone reviewed that the SRJC Forward was organized around majors and certificates, not departments. The Counseling Department has a variety of reasons for how things are placed, largely involving how things are coded in the Education Department and how certain career pathways are coded in the Holland Code system which the SRJC adopted for the onboarding process.

- Based on department meeting input, a Senator requested that Anthropology and Sociology be considered Social Sciences and not Behavioral Sciences.

CONSENT None

ACTION (3:45 – 4:25) Items must come from the Discussion agenda of a previous meeting or be carried over from a previous Action agenda.

1. **Proposed Treasurer Options as of 21 October 2026** *(10 min). Does the Academic Senate recommend the establishment of any of the proposed options?*
   a. ***Current fiscal activities of Academic Senate President and Administrative Assistant***
   b. ***CCC Senate Treasurer Positions Across the State identified by Claude***
   c. ***CCC State Treasurer Positions***

The Chair reviewed the three proposed options for the Treasurer position, establishing a separate role, integrating the responsibilities into an existing role, or eliminating a position to replace it with the Treasurer position.

- A Senator voiced concerns that adding a Treasurer role to the leadership of the Senate is a pressing issue and would rather advocate for the integrated approach instead of taking more Senate time to make a proposal that would be rejected with the state of the budget.
- A Senator clarified that if appropriate funding is not granted then the Senate would have to move to the integrated model.

Senator Melvin made a motion to establish a Senator position through the Integrated Approach model. Seconded.

- A Senator noted that this means we are asking people to work for no pay. It is unknown which position would be having additional work without pay. The Treasurer position is needed, and it is the job of the Senate to recommend what we need for the 10+1. A 10% reassigned-time allocation equals approximately 3.5 hours per week. The Treasurer role could be adjusted to fit available resources, including reduced meeting attendance and limited reporting responsibilities. The preference was to explore flexible alternatives rather than add excessive work to existing members of the Senate Executive Committee.
- A Senator noted they are not opposed to the motion. Negotiations do not happen for individual positions for the executive members; the negotiation is for the bank of hours. There are options to request additional reassigned time for new or expanded duties or redistribute the existing time allocation among Senate Executive Committee members.
- A Senator requested clarification on the separate role. There is an option to redistribute reassigned time to add an additional position instead of adding more work to an existing role.
- A Senator noted there is an elimination approach: eliminating the position of At-Large Representative and rewriting that position as Treasurer. This could be done without negotiation.
- A Senator voiced concern regarding conceding defeat before trying; this will prevent the Senate from documenting the efforts. Existing Senate Executive Committee members should not be expected to absorb additional unpaid responsibilities, and this Senator opposed the motion, advocating to formally request the needed time before considering alternatives.

Time ran out on this item.

The motion on the floor will need to be brought back.

Senators Lukas and Melvin will be called first when this item is brought back to the Senate.

2. **The Reorganization of Academic Affairs** *(30 min). What values does the Academic Senate recommend in the reorganization of Academic Affairs and Student Services? Consider the following materials:*
   a. ***Academic Affairs Reorganization (Sept 2nd) 1st Update and (Sept 16th) 2nd Update***
   b. ***Student Services Reorganization (Oct 7th) Update***
   c. ***SRJC Forward Proposal to reorganize Academic Affairs (Sept 30th)***
   d. ***Strategic Plan 2025-2030 and SRJC's Mission, Vision, Values***

DRAFT

e. BP 3410 Nondiscrimination and ADA Accessibility

The Chair requested that the Senators discuss what values the Senate is recommending in the reorganization of Student Services and Academic Affairs. When the final proposals come through to the Senate, they will be on the Consent agenda, and the parliamentary mic debate structure will be used. The Senate will vote up or down on whether the Senate supports the recommendations.

Senators gave the following feedback and recommendations:

- Prioritization of the 10+1 faculty input the reorganization, valuing faculty leadership and not eliminating positions that are faculty held leadership positions, particularly Department Chairs.
- Retention of the same current departmental autonomy when it comes to decisions related to curriculum and tutorial resources and not a loss of control in this area.
- Valuing our campuses and sites; they are not expendable and cannot be erased when there is a shortfall.
- Transparency in clearly explaining the rationale for changes being made, if fiscal or something else.
- The need for a clear understanding of how this reorganization improves the student experience.
- Keeping students at the center and explaining why each change is going to help the students; these are the main people we serve.
- Reorganization by departments and departmental interests and not by locations. departments and departmental interests and not by locations.
- Reflection on our value in the community and where we stand, especially given the fact that the AB Bond Measure just passed. How can we give to our community? Realization that we cannot do everything, and we should support the people who do want to come to the SRJC and to our classes.
- District to be clearer about exactly what they are considering. The vagueness around department issues, department chairs or structures is maddening and a morale problem. Repeating history without proper procedure is an issue. The Senator would appreciate knowing what is being put on the table.
- Concerns brought forward regarding SRJC Forward and receiving a lot of pushback from constituents feeling that departments and faculty were not involved in this, and it being developed by people that were not asking departments.
- Why is there a reorganization? Concerns raised regarding the lack of transparency regarding the proposed reorganization, including its financial and educational goals and consolidating leadership across multiple schools, redistributing faculty to different departments, job security, and class offerings. There is a need for clear information and reassurance from administration, as employees are experiencing uncertainty and concern about possible job losses and program changes.
- Clarification was given regarding the SRJC Forward: it is simply a product of how to align any reorganization with career and academic pathways that the committee was asked to produce. The committee was comprised of faculty, classified staff, associate faculty, and people from all over the campus and was not intended to consult with departments. The committee has no power to do any reorganizing; the chart is a recommendation to make something align with something the committee was already asked to do.
- Faculty members have felt left out and feel Senate leadership is showing favoritism to certain faculty, and they can easily add an action or discussion item like the reorganization, but not an open-ended discussion about Banner. The question of what values the Academic Senate recommends in the reorganization of Academic Affairs does not have any teeth. The values that people have expressed are more engagement across a broader section of the faculty membership and a non-biased Senate.
- Lack of understanding of the impact of the reorganization plan on the fiscal picture. This feels like reshuffling positions without seeing the benefits. Appreciation of the SRJC Forward path because it is student facing and will help students; this is a value. Looking for more information to understand why the reorganization is a productive exercise.
- Past reorganization plans have not met the goal. The current reorganization plan has not been hammered out. Concern that deans are already getting more work and being spread too thin. Concern for all employees. Faculty have been given enough already, and we need to start saying "no".
- Students must remain as the central priority of the reorganization. The reorganization should focus on

DRAFT

helping students enroll, remain enrolled, navigate processes, and complete their educational goals. Preserve unique and specialized programs and opportunities that distinguish SRJC. If changes or cuts are necessary, consideration should be given to integrating these offerings elsewhere, so students retain access to a broad range of opportunities. The SRJC's reputation is built not only on its programs and locations but also on the personal attention and support provided by faculty, staff, and administrators. This is what makes SRJC a preferred destination for students.

- The need to balance financial and operational realities with SRJC's tradition of personalized student support, while recognizing that changing student demographics and potentially declining enrollment will require the college to make changes. The reorganization should be guided by a clear vision of future students and their needs, with transparent district goals, values, and priorities, so the college community understands the purpose of the changes and how they will ultimately benefit students.
- Shared understanding of the District's goals with the reorganization, values, and their vision. There is no shared understanding of the goal.
- The reorganization process should reflect the College's stated commitments to anti-racism, decolonization, and respect for academic disciplines. Talk to the people in the disciplines and to find out where they belong rather than placing them where they think they will fit. The top-down discussion does not bring meaningful discussion, and there is a lack of transparency. There is a need to rethink an inclusive and accountable process that ensures all voices are heard and holds administration to the same anti-racist principles expected in the classroom.

The item ran out of time. Senators Oliver and Atilgan Relyea are in the queue when this is brought back.

BREAK

DISCUSSION (4:30 – 5:00) *note: items marked **[urgent*]** can be moved to Action and voted on in the same meeting*

1. **Academic Senate California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Resolution Packet Recommendations (30 min)** *What recommendations does the Academic Senate have for voting "in favor of" or "in opposition to" the forthcoming resolutions for **ASCCC Fall 2026 Plenary**?* **Resources include (as also available on the ASCCC Resolutions webpage):**
    a. **Pre-Plenary Session Resolutions Packet**
    b. **Area Meeting (9 October 2026) Presentation Slide Deck**

The Chair opened the floor for feedback on the proposed statewide resolutions.

- A Senator reviewed proposed amendments on #105.01.01 In-Person Assessments for Classes and encourages a NO vote. Having California require in person assessments for online courses creates significant equity and access concerns and limits faculty discretion on how student learning is assessed. It could be helpful for the Senate to submit their own amendment to counter this one.
- A Senator noted that it would be a NO vote on #105.01.01 In-Person Assessments for Classes if written as is.
- A Senator recommends a 114.03 which proposes requiring at least 12 months between the release of final Common Course Numbering templates and their implementation in Phase 3 and subsequent phases. The late template releases have created significant implementation challenges, and that additional lead time would allow colleges to prepare and implement the changes more effectively.
- A Senator noted constituents are opposed to 101.04 and 101.06.
    - It is vital that transfer institutions retain the right to refuse transfer credits for courses that do not include in-person proctored assessments.
    - A Senator noted there is support for 105.01; prefer 101.01.01 if 105.01 does not pass.
- A Senator supports 105.1 interpreting it as preparation for increasing requests from transfer-universities for in-person assessments and the need to develop proctoring centers and formal processes to ensure students' coursework meets transfer requirements.
- A Senator noted 104.01 ASCCC guidance on formalizing faculty consultation in CCAP discussions to ensure faculty and department chairs as well as the Senate are included in decisions with significant curriculum and student success implications.
- A Senator voiced a YES on 113.01, taking the word "Master" out of Master Plan.
- A Senator voiced concerns with Resolution 101.03 which focuses primarily on mirrored courses without

DRAFT

addressing the needs of noncredit students. As currently written, this is NO.

- A Senator addressed 110.02 regarding transparency around block grants. Suggested more clarity on the funding, if more than SEA funds then suggest a YES.
- A Senator voiced support for gradual implementation of in-person assessments and asked for clarification from the previous Senator that voiced a NO vote.
    - The concern is that faculty should have purview over their assessments, and the State should not make all assessments mandatory because not every assessment is done through taking a test at a testing center. There are many assessments that happen in different classes, so it is not a one-size-fits-all approach.
- A Senator urges a NO vote on 101.01 and NO on 101.06 and a YES on 105.01. In-person assessments will become increasingly important in mathematics and other disciplines as AI makes it easier for students to complete assignments without demonstrating their actual learning. There is a need to adapt assessment practices to verify student understanding and better prepare students as transfer institutions are seeing our students coming in underprepared.

The item is out of time. The Chair invited Senators Melvin, Atilgan Relyea, and Lukas to follow up directly on their recommendations for voting.

ADJOURNMENT 5:00 p.m.

DRAFT